

SEP 28 1965

September 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320008-7E

24413

A person like Chou En-lai, on the other hand, said to us something like the following: "The aid which we take the liberty of offering to you is not what we would like it to be. It is too modest, as compared with our feelings of friendship and esteem for you, and we thank you for being so kind as to accept it. We must make it clear to you that there are absolutely no strings attached to that aid, and that you are not required to give anything in return. It is an honor for us to be able to contribute, in an extremely small way, to your national construction (or defense) effort."

"We know that your progress is due solely to your own efforts, to the work and the sacrifices of your people. We greatly appreciate your friendship, but we do not demand that it be exclusive. We respect your non-alignment and understand very well that you have other good friends, even among the powers of the free world."

You will note the difference in the ways of giving. On one side we are being humiliated, we are given a lecture, we are required to give something in return. On the other side, not only is our dignity as poor people being preserved, but our self-esteem is being flattered—and human beings have their weaknesses, and it would be futile to try to eradicate.

As impossible it is for a Johnson to hide his pride of being rich, white, and powerful, it is just as impossible for us khmers to control our incoercible need for saving our dignity. For, while the rich, when he loses his honor still remains rich, the poor loses his last justification for existence.

Hence it is easy to understand that we would rather have a single Chinese yuan offered with tact than, let us say, 100 American dollars brutally thrown into our face.

If the Americans do not manage to understand us, let their friend and ally, President Diosdado Macapagal, of the Philippines, who will some day, in very similar terms, teach the overly insolent American journalists the same lesson, explain that phenomenon to them.

Another charge made by the Americans against the people who are under obligation to them and who nevertheless refuse to follow them in the domain of politics, is that they have sold out to the Communists.

Sold out—but to whom? No doubt, because the Yankoes are businessmen to the highest bidder.

Well, on that count, we could only sell out to the Americans, for the Soviet or Chinese Communists will never be rich enough to compete with Uncle Sam.

Cambodia, in spite of her very bad relations with the United States of America, has remained resolutely allergic to communism. But, as Mr. Bertil Gälland, a Swiss journalist, wrote with remarkable lucidity, the Americans don't know how to grab this chance (amazing for the free world) to have—not for them, but beside them—a Cambodia strongly attached to its monarchy.

"The Americans," that college writes, "ought to understand that the enthusiastic rallying of a people around their prince is a much more effective means for saving a country from communism than all the bombs of the Pentagon."

Not only does the United States of America not forgive Cambodia for being a friend of China, but it makes her furious to see the khmer people adulate—as they say—a leader who is not even republican (i.e., favoring the republic form of government), but a prince and a former king.

Mao Tse-tung takes pleasure in proclaiming that he prefers a prince refusing to align himself with the United States of America to a plebeian throwing himself into the arms of SEATO—and that choice [preference] is full of significance and intelligence.

I have been assured on many occasions that if I were not the head of the nation, I would be a prince.

lectuals would have become Communist—being pushed into the Communist camp by the lack of understanding, distrust, and injustice of the Americans and their disciples.

The Communist powers know perfectly well that my presence in the government serves as a restraint on the communization of Cambodia.

But they are much too smart to fight me and our government right now. They still need me for a while; they need my uncompromising nationalism, for Cambodia to resist the pressures and provocations of the American camp.

By fighting me now, the Communist powers would certainly not throw me into the arms of the free world, even less into the arms of the Americans. But they would alienate the majority of the khmer people, of our clergy, of our army, and of our police, who are irreversibly nationalistic. And that mistake would create insurmountable difficulties for a seizure of power by the Red khmers of the pracheachon and by the extreme left of the sangkum. The dispute would enable the third thief—the United States of America, Bangkok, Saigon, Son Ngoc Thanh—if not to seize the power, at least to create a dangerous confusion in our country.

I think that socialism will leave us alone, at least until the departure (with no return) of the United States of America from Indochina, which will incite Thailand to proclaim herself more neutralist than we are.

Then Cambodia will be a ripe fruit for the Communists to savor without even going to the trouble of picking it, as the Red khmers will make it drop directly into their mouth.

In striking contrast with the shrewdness of the Socialist camp, the United States of America is, through the channel of the CIA, deploying a vast anti-Sihanuk operation, not so much from South Vietnam, which has more serious worries, as from Thailand, which had been relatively spared. I shall cite the secessionist subversion attempt in our Koh Kong Province and the transfer of liberation troops (our rebels) from the South Vietnamese frontiers, almost lined in their entirety by the Vietcong, to Thailand.

These liberators are now planted all along the Dangrek Chain, engaging in unrestrained anti-Sihanuk and pro-free world propaganda activities and attacking our border posts in order to save us from enslavement by Peiping.

The Americans are forgetting that by uprooting our monarchy and discouraging Sihanuk and the Sangkum, they are eliminating all obstacles to the communization of our country. For the arrival here of a Son Ngoc Thanh, and, even more, of a Sam Sary, would immediately throw our young people, our peasants, our workers, and even our clergy, into the arms of Peiping and, necessarily, of Hanoi.

It is quite obvious that the CIA has not learned anything from the lessons of Cuba and Santo Domingo.

Judging incorrigible the CIA would "sack me," as the saying goes, to get rid of me as well as of the Sangkum.

I am warning the Americans, so long as we can contain the attacks of the Thanh traitors, we will remain neutral. When we can no longer do so, we will be forced—for which the United States of America is to blame—to go over into the Socialist camp, as Cuba did in the same circumstances, as one of these days the Dominican Republic will do and other nations of Latin America for which the United States of America, as a Washington-type policeman, happily departed on a witch hunt.

This is not a paradox, but a reality: U.S. policy and U.S. aid are the greatest purveyors of communism.

The United States of America has only one policy: if one is not for her, it is because one is against her. She accepts no other solu-

Sen. Wayne Morse:

THE FAILURE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE "THIRD WORLD"—SEEN THROUGH THE LESSON OF CAMBODIA

(By Norodom Sihanuk)

The Americans, who think they have all the resources for defending their cause and establishing their influence in the nations of the "third world" at the expense of the Socialist camp, are literally furious because they have known nothing but humiliating failures there, as in our country, for instance.

Undeniably they are very smart in the art of making money in business and industry, but when it comes to foreign policy they are intellectually not capable of understanding the reason for their failures and of learning from them in order to avoid further failures.

Many—and not the least of them—refuse to recognize their mistakes, and place the responsibility for their failure on the people whose hearts their country has been unable to win. They then call those countries "ingrates," even "seller-outers to communism."

"Ingratitude" is the first reproach—in plain words or in-between-the-lines—addressed by the Americans to those who have, for some reason or other, benefited from their aid and who then find themselves forced to adopt a cautious and sometimes hostile attitude toward them.

The American (and pro-American) newspapers keep on addressing that reproach to us. Mr. Dean Rusk himself, in the letter which he wrote to our Government on the occasion of the breaking of relations between our two countries, did not fail to remind us that the United States had given us substantial funds since 1955.

However poor psychologists they may be, the Americans ought to remember this proverb which every schoolboy in the world has learned: "It is not the gift that counts; it is the way in which it is given."

On extending American generosity to the "third world," President Johnson said, in substance, "We are a white, rich, and advanced Nation. You are a colored, poor, and backward country. Because we are civilized, we are giving you our pity and our money. However, you must show us the gratitude that a poor man owes the generous and important man who helps him. The least you can do, however, is to approve everything we do, without ever criticizing us. You must help us repel communism in your zone. And don't you ever forget it, if your stomach is less empty, if you have weapons for fighting the Reds and your rebels, if your country can become modernized, you owe it to us, the Americans."

¹ Source: Kambuya (illustrated monthly), August 15, 1965, editorial, pp. 19-25; translated from French by Eugene D. ...